

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-9, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19 and 21 are amended, claim 2 is canceled, and claims 26-30 are added.

Independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of now canceled dependent claim 2, as well as features neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the references.

Dependent claims 3-9, 12, 13, and 15 are amended to depend on independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 18 and 19 are amended to obviate a rejection. Claim 21 is amended to incorporate features neither disclosed nor suggested by any of the references. Claims 26-30 are added to depend from claim 1. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Office Action indicates that claims 22-25 are allowable and that claims 7, 14, and 16 contain allowable subject matter. However, for at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 10, 11, 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,778,210) in view of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,226); rejects claims 2, 5, 12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugahara et al. in view of Takahashi et al. and further in view of Horiuchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,037,972); rejects claims 3 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugahara et al. in view of Takahashi et al. in view of Horiuchi et al. and further in view of Konishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,420,635); rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugahara et al. in view of Takahashi et al. in view of Horiuchi et al. in view of Yamasaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020044772) and further in view of Konishi et al.; rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

as being unpatentable over Sugahara et al. in view of Takahashi et al. in view of Horiuchi et al. and further in view of Allen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,430,480); rejects claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugahara et al. in view of Takahashi et al. in view of Horiuchi et al. and further in view of Tamura et al . (U.S. Patent No. 6,040,860); rejects claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugahara et al. in view of Takahashi et al. in view of Horiuchi et al. and further in view of Mathew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,711); and rejects claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugahara et al. in view of Takahashi et al. in view of Horiuchi et al. in view of Mathew et al. and further in view of Konishi et al. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the characteristic features of claims 1 and 21. For example, as generally recited in claims 1 and 21, a high-frequency component of a spatial frequency contained in the second image data of a second exposure time is less than a high-frequency component of a spatial frequency contained in the first image data of a first exposure time. The image processing device generates third image data in which blur has been corrected by correcting at least the high-frequency component of the spatial frequency contained in the second image data.

Sugahara only discloses that an exposure time is equally divided.

Takahashi discloses that a plurality of pictures of different exposures can be obtained. Takahashi merely discloses the correction of white blankings and blackenings by combining the plurality of pictures (column 2, lines 1-5 and column 6, lines 36-43), but does not disclose or suggest image blur correction and a difference in high-frequency components of the plurality of pictures.

Horiuchi discloses an autofocus adjustment by a known blur detecting method on the basis of a high frequency video signal (column 3, lines 40-45). However, Horiuchi does not

disclose or suggest successively generating first image data and second image data with different exposure times, as well as generating third image data with corrected blur.

Accordingly, neither Sugahara, Takahashi, nor Horiuchi, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claims 1 and 21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 21 define patentable subject matter. Claims 3-6, 8-13, 15, 17-20 and 26-30 depend from claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Thus Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15, 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-30 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration No. 57,473

MAC:BAZ/kzb

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: December 22, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--